

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3208-2024
Date of Decision:22.04.2024

Sharanjit Kaur ...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

Coram : Hon’ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Vikram Satpal Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to issue appropriate directions to respondents No. 2 to 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and her family members.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that one FIR No. 52 dated 09.03.2024 was registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural (Annexure P-1) against Satta Naushehra and two unidentified persons on the basis of the statement made by Arpit Jain. He further contends that the after the registration of the FIR, the police officials are raiding the house of the petitioner again and again. In fact, Arpit Jain and Manpreet Singh, son of the petitioner having cordial relations with each other and now Manpreet Singh, son of the petitioner had left India for Europe on 21.02.2024. He further contends that the some unknown persons had fired at the shop of Arpit Jain and the petitioner had no role to play in the said incident. He further contends that

the petitioner is being un-necessarily harassed by the local police.

3. A short reply by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Jandiala, Amritsar Rural has been filed on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 and the same is taken on record.

4. Learned State counsel submits that during the course of investigation, it has been found that Manpreet Singh, son of the petitioner had done the recce of the shop of Arpit Jain and thereafter, he had gone abroad. He further contends that the Manpreet Singh had got the firing done at the shop of Arpit Jain, complainant and Manpreet Singh has already been nominated as an accused in the present case. Learned State counsel further submits that till date, the involvement of the petitioner has not been found in the above stated case. However, in case, it is found that the petitioner is involved in the above stated case in any manner, she will be joined in the investigation by following the due process of law.

5. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, nothing survives in the present petition and the petition is accordingly disposed off.

22.04.2024
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No